

Evaluating a telehealth intervention for urinalysis monitoring in children with neurogenic bladder

Journal:	<i>Journal of Child Health Care</i>
Manuscript ID	JCHC-2018-0042.R1
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Keyword:	Telehealth, remote patient monitoring, neurogenic bladder, Parents, soft systems methodology
Abstract:	<p>Telehealth as a community-monitoring project within children's urology care is an innovative development. There is limited evidence of the inclusion of staff and parents in the early stage development and later adoption of telehealth initiatives within routine urological nursing care or families' management of their child's bladder. The aim was to explore the experiences of key stakeholders (parents, clinicians, technical experts) of the proof of concept telehealth intervention in terms of remote community-based urinalysis monitoring by parents of their child's urine. A concurrent mixed-methods research design using soft-systems methodology tools to inform data collection and analysis following interviews, observation and e-surveys with stakeholders. The parents adopted aspects of the telehealth intervention (urinalysis) but were less engaged with the voiding diary and weighing. The parents gained confidence in decision making and identified that the intervention reduced delays in their child receiving appropriate treatment, decreased the time burden and improved engagement with general practitioners. Managing the additional workload was a challenge for the clinical team. Parental empowerment and self-efficacy were clear outcomes from the intervention. Parents exercised their confidence and control and were selective about which aspects of the intervention they perceived as having credibility and which they valued.</p>

Evaluating a telehealth intervention for urinalysis monitoring in children with neurogenic bladder

Background

The management of neurogenic bladder in children with spina bifida, a neural tube defect, can be problematic for healthcare providers, as well as their parents (National Clinical Guidance Centre, 2012; Smith et al., 2016). The personal, physical, health and economic costs of managing neurogenic lower urinary tract dysfunction as a result of spina bifida are considerable (Ouyang et al., 2007). Children with neurogenic bladders are prone to developing urinary tract infections (UTI) as a result of neurogenic damage and bladder management approaches, i.e. intermittent catheterisation (Kaye et al., 2016). Furthermore, recurrent infections, illness and incontinence episodes can impact on short and long term health as well as quality of life (Padua et al., 2002; Lemelle et al., 2006). Therefore, early detection and management of the child’s urine infection is important (Dik et al., 2006). Telehealth offers the potential for both improving the child’s health and easing the demands made on families caring for children with complex health care needs (Cady et al., 2009).

Although telemedicine and telehealth are seen as discrete entities by some authors, both The Cochrane Library (Cochrane Library, 2010) and the WHO (World Health Organization, 2009) acknowledge that definitions overlap (Carter, 2014). Broadly, telehealth is the capacity to use technologies which enable patients and clinicians to remotely exchange information about the patient’s health (Hendy et al., 2012). Such technologies are suggested to enhance health outcomes, particularly for those located in rural and remote communities who would otherwise not receive timely access to services (Fraser et al., 2017) or those marginalized due to mobility restrictions or caring responsibilities (Kruse et al 2017). In North America (Muttitt et al., 2004; Call et al., 2015) and Australasia (Smith et al., 2015; Caffery et al., 2017) while in Canada there has been various levels of uptake of telemedicine and telehealth in healthcare settings within urban and Aboriginal contexts (Jennett et al., 2003). In the United Kingdom (UK), digital and information technology (IT)

systems within health care have mostly grown in primary and community sectors (Honeyman et al., 2016) and implementation initiatives have tended to focus on elderly care and long-term conditions such as heart failure (Taylor et al., 2015b). Aware of the need to move forward, a national advisory group reporting to the UK government highlights the need to harness digital solutions within secondary care (Watcher, 2016). In respect of children, NHS England (2016) states that future children's services will be supported by digital transformation plans. However, Watcher (2016) warns that getting it right as opposed to doing it fast is critical if the UK is to achieve the 'triple aim' of improving care, improving population health and reducing health care costs (Berwick et al., 2008; Dorsey and Topol, 2016). Telehealth offers great promise but as a 'young' health intervention (Kruse et al., 2017) evidence explaining success, failure, acceptability and sustainability is needed (Greenhalgh et al., 2017a, 2017b; Albury et al., 2018). The challenges in the development and uptake of telehealth are multifactorial (Greenhalgh et al., 2017a, Mistry, 2012); barriers include limitations with telehealth equipment and the complexities of data sharing (Taylor et al., 2015a; Standing et al., 2018), variable organizational support (Odeh et al., 2014), low staff engagement and increased workload (MacNeill et al., 2014), and sustainability (Taylor et al., 2015b). A key challenge highlighted by Greenhalgh et al.'s work (2017a, 2017b) is the potentially 'brittle' (fixed and a tendency to lack resilience) nature of software systems as compared to flexibility embedded within human systems which can more easily absorb and respond to changes. To address the question of how successful telehealth interventions work, a realist review (Vassilev et al., 2015) highlights that interventions can deliver benefits for patients and care providers when attention is given to: 1) the relationships that can be fostered; 2) the fit with existing lifestyles or preferred routines; 3) enhancing the visibility/awareness of the health concern.

Few studies have explored telehealth in paediatric populations; existing research predominantly focuses on remote co-ordination of health care (Vigil et al., 2015) with tele-psychiatry finding a place in parent educational and coaching models (Becevic et al., 2016, Little et al., 2016). There is evidence of successful use of telehealth with small groups of children with complex needs in the home setting (Cady et al., 2008; Hepburn et al., 2016).

More evidence is needed around the development and planning phase to get telehealth ‘right’ (Watcher, 2016; Standing et al., 2018;) for children, their families and the health care teams delivering care (Brophy 2017, Kruse et al., 2017, Ray et al., 2017).

In this paper, we describe a proof of concept six-month pilot and evaluation of a telehealth intervention for children under five years of age with neurogenic bladder. The evaluation incorporated soft systems methodology tools which guided an analysis of the interaction between the people and technology central to the home-based telehealth intervention.

The Telehealth Intervention

Building on national best practice guidance recommendations (National Clinical Guidance Centre, 2012) and parents’ accounts of wanting to be able to better manage their child’s symptoms of suspected UTI, a collaborative team of stakeholders (parents, the urology team, hospital innovation team, commercial partner and call centre staff) was established. A process-based method for project management (PRINCE2) was used to underpin the development of the intervention. The intervention ran from July 2014-January 2015 and was underpinned by local patient safety directives and governance systems.

Development of intervention

The telehealth intervention was developed with stakeholder requirements foregrounded, in line with Vassilev et al.’s (2015) conclusions that early ‘upfront consideration’ should be given to the mechanisms important in determining success in development, implementation and outcome of any telehealth approach. The early engagement approach was intended to ensure a patient-centred approach and generate additional benefits for the parents (i.e. enhanced knowledge base about their child’s bladder, increased sense of empowerment in clinical consultations, and confidence in knowing when to seek further medical advice). The stakeholders wished to develop a system that would record and alert parents (e.g., through a visual indicator of symptoms) and urology nursing staff to signs of likely urine infection. It also aimed to create a mechanism for collecting and transmitting data required by secondary care providers working to meet national standards (National Clinical Guidance

Centre [NICE], 2012). The final telehealth package was a digital system (see Table 1) that parents could use at home. This package monitored and recorded information about the child's urinary tract health, sent data directly, via a NHS approved secure server to the commercial partner's data collection centre (CPDCC). However, the commercial team project members involved in the direct implementation of the intervention did not have access to patient data. The CPDCC analysed the data as per agreed protocol and alerted the clinical team as indicated advising the nurse to log into the secure system and identify which patient required follow-up. As part of the proof of concept, the stakeholders were keen to explore if the telehealth intervention was helpful or burdensome in everyday life. Additionally, stakeholders wanted to consider the feasibility of telehealth as an approach to meet the NICE CG148 (2012) minimum standards of care for assessment and management of urinary incontinence in neurological disease.

Insert Table 1 about here please

Self-selection of families to use the intervention

All families (n=21) known to the urology nursing team whose children were < 5 years old, had had surgically corrected spina bifida, were under the care of one of the three hospital urologists, and were being intermittently catheterised by their parent were invited by letter to participate in the pilot. Parents were reassured that engagement in the pilot would not impact on their child's standard care pathway and they could continue to access the urology service if they had concerns. Self-selection was crucial since reports suggest that ambivalence towards telehealth will challenge utility (Sanders et al., 2012). Families agreed to submit bi-weekly voiding diary data (bladder and bowel information and urinalysis). Mobile and Bluetooth enabled devices were to be used to collect, produce print-outs and automatically transfer the information to the analytics team, who raise alerts when recordings were outside of normal ranges. Of the 21 eligible families, 12 replied and the first 10 replies were accepted onto the intervention (due to there being only 10 intervention kits available through commercial partner provision). The families lived between 2-116 km away from the hospital.

A workable telehealth system requires selection of appropriate technologies and the development of tailored training (Vassilev et al., 2015) and in this instance frontline training was provided as detailed in Table 2.

Insert Table 2 about here please

The Evaluation

The focus in this paper is on the experiences of the clinical team and the parents although some responses from the technical teams are interwoven in the findings.

The key aim was to explore parents’, clinicians’ and technical experts’ experiences of telehealth intervention, including the effectiveness of the proof of concept telehealth intervention in terms of remote community urinalysis monitoring by parents of their child’s urine.

Evaluation design

This evaluation used a concurrent mixed methods research design (Creswell, 2011); our methods involved interviews and observation (qualitative) and e-surveys for the clinicians and a researcher administered survey for parents (quantitative). In addition, in order to structure both data collection and analysis we used two evaluation-oriented tools: a strengths, challenges, opportunities and barriers (SCOB) matrix and from soft systems methodology the, CATWOE (customers, actors, transformation, worldview, ownership, environmental constraints) analysis (Checkland and Scholes, 1999; Checkland, 2000). This soft systems methodology initially frames real-world situations in a fairly unstructured yet problem focused way working from a Root Definition (statement of purpose) towards conceptual model thinking and finally exploring solution orientated actions. This approach can be helpful in untangling the evaluative lessons from projects that have multiple goals often linked to the perspectives of each stakeholder (Burge, 2015).

Sample

Our sample was drawn from three stakeholder groups who were involved in the telehealth intervention: the parents of children who met the inclusion criteria for the intervention, as previously described; members of the nursing team from the children's urology service and the technical experts (six from the commercial partner and five from the hospital). All potential participants were sent detailed Participant Information Sheets that explained the project and their rights to decline to participate and withdraw from the study if they wished without their child's care (parent participants) or their working life (clinicians) being affected.

Data collection

Qualitative data (interviews and observation)

We undertook semi-structured interviews with parents at three time-points (TP). These were undertaken either face-to-face or by telephone, depending on the parents' preferences; most preferred telephone interviews as they were "easier to fit into a busy life". At TP1 baseline we focused on generating baseline data on parents' previous experiences/outcomes with their child's urinary tract infections and on their perspectives and understanding of telehealth. At TP2 midway through the intervention we focused on the parents' experiences of using with the equipment and drilled down to explore any issues and challenges. At TP3 on completion of the intervention, we focused on their overall experiences and lessons learned. The CATWOE was used to help us structure the interview to ensure we focused on their perspectives and understanding of the telehealth intervention and we purposefully explored issues surrounding self-efficacy and mastery in relation to their engagement/transformation with telehealth.

Additionally, we observed group meetings that were facilitated by the clinical staff to provide additional support to the parents. Our observation of the groups was guided by the use of a template that addressed a range of issues including: communication styles; opportunities for parents to demonstrate learning/issues/concerns; tone, agency, key actors, power; barriers/facilitators; time burden of being part of project; emerging ideas/solutions; and power dynamics.

Quantitative data

We sent e-surveys to the nursing team and technical experts (commercial and in-house) at the same three TPs described earlier. The questions were designed around the SCOB and focused on preparation, training and day-to-day experiences of the intervention. We also administered the General Self-Efficacy Scale (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) to parents as part of our interview encounter with the parents to allow us to track changes, if any in self-efficacy over the course of the intervention. The e-surveys for clinicians and technical team were mostly closed response questions with some open-ended questions. These surveys collected data on a range of subjects including: their prior experience of telehealth, expectations and level of confidence with telehealth, expected beneficiaries, the training for parents, burden of time taken up by telehealth intervention and impact on standard clinical workload and strengths, successes, and barriers to implementation.

Ethics

Ethics approval (STEMH 265) was provided by the STEMH Ethics Committee at the University of Central Lancashire. Informed written consent was gained from all participants by a member of the research team and ongoing verbal consent was gained from participants who engaged in more than one element of data collection (e.g., being both interviewed and observed). As the stakeholder groups were small we took considerable care to ensure anonymity and confidentiality but made it clear that anonymity was not possible to achieve between participants attending group sessions.

Data analysis

The qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis (Attride Stirling, 2001) and we also drew on CATWOE analysis, developed from soft systems methodology (Checkland and Scholes, 1999; Checkland, 2000) as this provided a framework of six key elements for considering the root definitions of the complex intervention and allowed us to examine the consonance/dissonance of the expectations of the three key stakeholder groups. The quantitative data were analysed using descriptive statistics (mean, mode, median) and data are presented as raw numbers and percentages, as appropriate. The following abbreviations are used: Clinical Team (CT); Technical Team (TT); Parent (P).

Results

The results are presented in three sections; (1) Perspectives of the Clinical Team and the Technical Team; (2) Parents' Perspectives and (3) the CATWOE analysis.

Perspectives of the clinical team and the technical team

Experiences of start-up

At the start-up stage there was considerable positivity from all participants about what the intervention could do, such as *"change the reliance of the care pathway from a clinician centred model to a child centred model"* (CT). There were some initial concerns raised during the start-up stage in relation to the intervention kit where the *"the IT kit didn't work when we had to load patient data [manually]"* (CT). The key barriers initially were *"unfamiliarity with telehealth"*, *"lack of time"*, *"technical issues with the equipment"* and the need for *"better communication between the us and them [CT and TT]"*.

Experiences at the end of the intervention

By the end of the intervention there was general agreement that a *"clear[er] communication should have been in place"* (TT). It was also evident that the intervention was *"overlayed on the Urology team's day job rather than a fully managed service"* and the time burden of the intervention on the clinical staff varied according to the *"number/content of alerts, clinical workload and staffing levels"* (CT). There were some negative impacts on the regular service and some disappointment with some aspects of the intervention:

"...extra time, difficulty contacting families, GP and chasing results - disappointing that the families didn't complete the diary this was a key aspect of the study" (CT).

There were also difficulties for the CT in contacting parents when an alert has been triggered which required a clinical response as:

"...many families just don't reply. It seems to depend on how you phrase the message" (CT).

The CT identified the need to follow these issues up with the user group. Attitudes about the pilot ranged from frustration to varying levels of enthusiasm with particular focus on the impact the pilot had on daily nursing workload and interruption in families lives. Having access to technical support as well as the dedicated resources and disposables necessary to manage the pilot project were cited as essential by staff. Staff training and the partnership approach with the commercial partner and families were considered a success in operationalizing the pilot.

Changes and benefits of participation

By the end of the intervention the CT noted a range of changes in the parents’ participating in the intervention. These included greater empowerment, increased knowledge and raised awareness of infection (see Figure 1).

Insert Figure 1 about here please

However, there were some less positive changes noted although these were generally more short-term and reflected concerns at the start of the parents’ engagement with the technology (see Figure 2).

Insert Figure 2 about here please

Benefits for families and staff resulting from participating in the intervention

Parents were perceived to benefit from being more confident and more empowered with the lowest benefits being linked to ‘extended vocabulary to talk to GP’ and ‘improved communication with GP’ (see Figure 3). Interestingly this was at odds with how parents described the benefits in their interviews.

Insert Figure 3 about here please

Overall the CT and the TT reported benefiting from their engagement in the intervention as can be seen in Figure 4. These benefits broadly reflected the topics of: care management, working with parents and personal professional development.

Insert Figure 4 about here please

Parents' perspectives

The parents (n=8) who participated in the interviews had children aged from 16 months – 4 years. All of the parents we interviewed felt that they had benefited from the intervention and wanted to continue with the urinalysis aspect of the intervention and to retain the use of the equipment; the print out of the child's results was highly valued. However, they were much less interested in the other aspects – weight, temperature and voiding diary. Whilst some families tried to comply with weighing (n=6) and some had tried to comply with taking their child's temperature (n=6). However, compliance was inconsistent due to problems with the technology, for example, *"the thermometer was a pain initially. Coordinating into his ear. He didn't like it"* (P4). There were some challenges with weighing the child such as the scales *"never working properly"* or mobility-related problems such as:

"My little boy can't stand up so what I had to do was I had to stand on them and send them that result and then stand on them with my little boy and send that result" (Parent 6)

Families who had tried using the voiding diary had found *"getting the urine sample [volume], that's the hard bit!"* (P1); accuracy was hard to achieve as catching the urine in a measuring jug was difficult. For some parents this also had an impact on their daily routine as one parent explained *"I had to get her up earlier so I could fit [the monitoring] in in the morning before she was getting ready for school"* (P7). There were also problems with incomplete delivery of the equipment (e.g., the jug for measuring urine):

"We didn't have as many testing strips and we didn't have as many covers for the thermometers...we could only do the temperature testing for about the first 2-3 weeks" (P2).

One father commented when asked about the best and worst things about the equipment explained he was *"struggling"* with the *"voiding diary"* as it *"hadn't been explained properly"* (P4). Another parent explained that their chief difficulty was that they had experienced a burglary and part of the equipment (the telephone) had been stolen. It had

not been possible to replace the stolen equipment and so this had limited their ability to take advantage of the telehealth service.

The following two themes summarise the parents’ experiences of the intervention and their suggestions for improvement and the ways in which it impacted on their lives and the lives of their families.

Generating a sense of self-empowerment and self-efficacy

It was clear that parents valued the ability that telehealth gave them to be able to ‘get on’ with life, *“to know what was going on”* and able to *“just crack on with it basically”* (Parent 1). Although telehealth did not wave a magic wand and dismiss the parents’ concerns and worries, life became easier when they had worries as it introduced a structured way of dealing with their concerns that fitted with their ability to make decisions and take action:

“It just made life so much easier having the equipment at home, if we were worried, if he had a temperature, the first thing we think of is test his urine” (Parent 3).

Parents felt empowered by having the *“proper equipment”*, knowing how to use it, being able to check things *“properly”*:

“... that way I know I’m making the right decision on whether to take her up to the hospital, take her to the doctors or make a phone call” (P7).

Many of the parents talked about how they valued the way the intervention had helped them, giving them *“a bit more confidence”* about what actions to take. Another parent explained *“it gives me the confidence that I can deal with it rather than putting him through an A+E experience again”* (P8). They made particular reference to the urine test print out, which provided visible and credible evidence of their concerns. Having the print out appeared to empower parents and supported a shift in the relationship dynamic with GP front desk staff. Parents explained the GP staff *“have to pay more attention, they listen to you and we get seen by a doctor quicker now”*. The ‘authority of the machine’ also helped to

1
2
3
4 increase parents' awareness and deepened their knowledge, for example, *"now I'd say that*
5 *there is protein in the urine"*. It also stimulated their thinking - *"what do these symbols stand*
6 *for?"* - and acted in a pedagogical manner extending the parents' vocabulary, as one parent
7 explained:
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 *"I know new words now.... you know words that the machine says" (P1).*
15

16 The parents all wanted to *"keep the machine"* and were positive about the ability to test
17 their child's urine and having a print out of results. However, the parents were less positive
18 about weight, temperature and the voiding diary as previously presented.
19
20
21

22 ***Normalising life and reducing hassles of everyday management***

23 The intervention helped to normalise life and reduce the hassles usually associated with
24 managing their child's neuropathic bladder such as not having to *"drag all the kids to the*
25 *doctor"*. Saving parents' time was highly valued by the parents as it meant they were able to
26 get *"the results back there and then"* and they were not *"having to worry about every little*
27 *thing...[or] rush off to hospital every time we think there is problem"*(P1). It also avoided the
28 hassles associated with waiting to be seen by staff in the Emergency Department at the
29 hospital and also having to repeat the child's history to a doctor who was unfamiliar with
30 the child and having to go through *"the big rigmarole of going through all his history again"*
31 (P8). Therefore, the intervention was perceived as a means to minimise the inconvenience
32 caused by care of a child with a neuropathic bladder and in that way it offered a 'good fit'
33 with their lives and preferred routines.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 *"The best thing is it's easy to test instead of going to the Doctors." (P2)*
45

46 One of the parents talked of telehealth being a *"godsend"* and explained that she was the
47 *"first one to volunteer"* (P5).
48
49
50

51 However, there were some drawbacks to telehealth as the alerts were not always helpful.
52 Whilst these 'unhelpful' alerts were a bit of an issue, they were viewed as being much less
53 of a *"hassle"* and more easily sorted than having to *"drag"* the family up to the hospital.
54
55
56

Lessons were learned during the course of the intervention so that these machine-related hassles such as *“false positives”* were more easily managed, understood and overcome. Another parent explained that even though *“it’s not always accurate and the testing sticks sometimes gave wrong readings”* that they would be *“lost without it [machine]”* (P2).

The root definition and CATWOE analysis

The core components of the evaluation were to understand the system purpose, the various stakeholder perspectives and the transformation generated by the system. The Root Definition (system purpose) was established as part of the telehealth intervention development phase and informed the CATWOE analysis embedded within the evaluation phase. Table 3 summarises data set against the CATWOE six key elements at time points 1 and 3 and illustrates system features that impacted positively and negatively on the effectiveness of the telehealth intervention.

Insert Table 3 about here please

The CATWOE analysis shows that over time the child remains the core customer, though additional actors, contributing to the system purpose, are identified i.e. general practice staff. As transformations take effect, new environmental, ownership and world view features become apparent. For example, by using and learning from the technology, parents use new resources (personal confidence and material print outs) to advocate for their child. Use of the technology, also generates ‘alerts’ and a need for regular supplies of disposable equipment, placing new demands on the clinical team, owners of the integral support system required for operating the telehealth intervention. Errors in the technical system that generate false positive alerts and equipment/monitoring systems that have a poor fit with parents’ care practices create negative impacts on some of the environment features and world view thinking.

As noted, the clinical team own the support system required to operationalise the intervention, however it is the commercial partner who own the product and knowledge of how it works. This means that when technical glitches occur, the clinical team do not have the ‘know how’ to correct these and cannot offset the burden that glitches introduce. For

the clinical team, this increases workload and frustration with the intervention. When the project was operational, these local environmental features became prominent and overshadowed the national environmental features (policy) originally used as motivators for setting up the pilot.

Discussion

The findings clearly show the ways in which the parents developed a greater sense of self-efficacy in relation to the management of their child's neuropathic bladder. The concept of self-efficacy encompasses the belief a person has in their own ability to act (Bandura, 1982). Self-efficacy encompasses issues such as engagement, mastery and feedback; these components figured strongly within the parents' feedback. The parents reported that they felt they were better positioned to act and more confident in the decisions they were making and the actions they were taking as a result of components of the telehealth intervention. Other studies included within a systematic review of patient satisfaction with telehealth demonstrate that enhanced confidence, self-efficacy, self-awareness and self-management and timely diagnosis due to increased access to care are from the patient perspective, some of the most positive outcomes (Kruse et al., 2017). Other evidence indicates too, that telehealth can be acceptable to young people and families Gur et al. (2016).

The adoption of the telehealth intervention was partial as parents were selective in which aspects of the intervention they engaged with showing a strong attachment to the urinalysis machine and a lack of engagement with those aspects they did not highly value such as weight scales and diary; this is also seen in studies where technology that does not meet the needs of the parent/caregiver is not adopted (Bradford et al., 2016). Realist review evidence argues that successful telehealth interventions are argued to operate through mechanisms of: enabling professional relationships, lifestyle fit and visibility of issues (Vassilev et al., 2015). Consistent with this, parents engaged with the component of the intervention that fitted with family priorities, supported health issue awareness and enabled helpful interactions with professionals. Whilst the CT might have hoped for a wholesale adoption

of the intervention as a means of improving practice and ensuring compliance with best practice guidelines, the parents’ partial engagement indicated that only parts of the intervention embedded the necessary mechanisms required for success. Further, the parents’ decisions to exert control over the intervention and be selective does strongly reflect the parents’ self-efficacy about making choices. It appeared, as elsewhere (Radhakrishnan et al., 2016), parents’ satisfaction levels with telehealth outstrip those of clinicians.

Parents gained mastery through their acquisition of knowledge and their extended vocabularies and found that the ‘authority of the technology’ gave them an additional tool to use in dialogues with GPs and their staff. The ability of the parents to be able to undertake ‘chart talk’ (Mattingly, 1991); communicate in a way that conveyed a sense of speaking the same language as providers seemed to elevate their requests and insights from those of ‘just’ being a parent, to a more informed position. This, from the parent perspective, transformed interactions between parents and GPs and their staff and supported interactions that resulted in accessing timely support for their child.

Parents were clear about their level of satisfaction with the technology and were direct in their critical feedback of situations when their needs were not being met. For example, the breakdown in the supply chain impacted on the quality of the intervention package. The parents were also insightful about the fact that some pieces of technology (e.g., the scales) were not perceived to be fit for purpose. Though, Greenhalgh et al. (2017b) indicates, managing technology ‘brittleness’ means innovations need design work beyond the development phase and on into implementation when multiple users engage differently with the technology. The most successful telehealth interventions are ones which are tailored to the needs of the patients (Radhakrishnan et al., 2016) and finding the ‘sweet spot’ where an innovation achieves full purpose, therefore requires continual development.

Overall, the proof of concept telehealth intervention was effective in terms of demonstrating that remote community urinalysis monitoring by parents of their child’s urine was possible. To a considerable extent this was the result of early inclusion and

cognitive participation of parents and other stakeholders in the development and design of the intervention and in the ongoing challenges of overcoming barriers as seen in other studies (Mair et al., 2012). The CT had to manage a fluctuating telehealth workload and this created challenges on top of an existing full workload. However, although telehealth was a new innovation in this setting, there are drivers external to the organisation as well as internal drivers such as the families' desire to undertake monitoring at home that means telehealth is likely to become a more common aspect of future practice (Jury and Kornberg, 2016) and part of the everyday clinical workload.

Limitations

A limitation of this study is that it was a small scale pilot study of one specific telehealth intervention from one tertiary children's hospital. As such, the findings cannot be generalised to a wider population. The intervention was in place for a relatively short space of time and therefore the effects seen may not be sustained over a longer period of time.

Conclusion and Implications

The telehealth intervention was evaluated as a system, with a number of stakeholders experiencing different outcomes. Parental empowerment and self-efficacy were clear outcomes for parents who exercised confidence and control in selecting aspects of the intervention they perceived as having credibility and which were of value to them. This mainly included the urinalysis testing system, an element that fitted with their priorities (reduce wasted time) and that provided a credible resource (print out) to make health concerns more visible. Familiarity and use of with the testing system helped parents articulate their needs and enter in to health dialogues with GPs. This supported easier access to timely help for their child, which in turn reduced family disruption. However, other system features that had a poor fit with parental priorities (diary recording) were not used and therefore benefits for the clinical team (collection of routine data to meet national standards) were not realised. Furthermore, the part of the system that was used by parents, sometimes generated false positive alerts due to technical glitches, and whilst not troublesome for parents, these alerts placed additional demand on the clinical team. This

uneven picture exemplified how innovation needs to continue whilst technology products are being implemented, otherwise a good fit for all stakeholders will not be realised and the potential for the product to offer benefits will be lost.

References

Albury D, Beresford T, Dew S, Horton T, Illingworth J and Langford K (2018) Against the Odds: Successful scaling innovation in the NHS. The Health Foundation. Available at: <http://www.health.org.uk/publications> (Accessed 11 February 2018)

Becevic M, Green T, Walker LY, Hicks L and Mutrux ER (2016) Are There Other Options?: Child and Adolescent Telepsychiatry Services for Rural Population. *Journal of Health Management* 18(2): 290-294.

Bradford NK, Caffery LJ and Smith AC (2016) Telehealth services in rural and remote Australia: a systematic review of models of care and factors influencing success and sustainability. *Rural and Remote Health* 16(4): 3808.

Brophy PD (2017) *Overview on the Challenges and Benefits of using Telehealth Tools in a Pediatric Population*. *Telehealth in Nephrology*. 24(1): 17-21.

Burge S (2015) *An overview of the soft systems methodology. Systems thinking: Approaches and Methodologies*. Rugby, Burge Hughes Walsh Limited. Available at: <https://www.burgehugheswalsh.co.uk/Articles-and-Papers.aspx> (Accessed 9 February 2018)

Cady R, Finkelstein S and Kelly A (2009) A telehealth nursing intervention reduces hospitalizations in children with complex health conditions. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 15(6): 317-320.

Cady R, Kelly A and Finkelstein S (2008) Home telehealth for children with special health-care needs. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 14(4): 173-177.

Caffery, L. J., Bradford, N. K., Wickramasinghe, S. I., Hayman, N., & Smith, A. C. (2017) Outcomes of using telehealth for the provision of healthcare to aboriginal and torres strait islander people: A systematic review. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, 41(1): 48-53.

Call VRA, Erickson LD, Dailey NK, Hicken BL, Rupper R, Yorgason JB, et al. (2015) Attitudes Toward Telemedicine in Urban, Rural, and Highly Rural Communities. *Telemedicine and E-Health* 21(8): 644-651.

Carter B (2014) Technology adoption in health care: International barriers and opportunities to telemedicine. *Journal of Child Health Care* 18(4): 299-301.

Checkland P (2000) Soft systems methodology: A thirty year retrospective. *Systems Research and Behavioral Science* 17: S58.

Checkland P and Scholes J (1999) *Soft Systems Methodology in Action*. Chichester: Wiley.

Cochrane Library (2010) *Special Collection: Telemedicine*. updated 8 October 2010 with the addition of one new review. Available at:
[http://www.cochranelibrary.com/app/content/special-collections/article/?doi=10.1002/\(ISSN\)14651858\(CAT\)na\(VI\)SC000013](http://www.cochranelibrary.com/app/content/special-collections/article/?doi=10.1002/(ISSN)14651858(CAT)na(VI)SC000013) (Accessed 13 February 2018)

Dik P, Klijn AJ, van Gool JD, de Jong-de Vos van Steenwijk, Catherine C E and de Jong, Tom P V M (2006) Early Start to Therapy Preserves Kidney Function in Spina Bifida Patients. *European Urology* 49(5): 908-913.

Fraser, S., Mackean, T., Grant, J., Hunter, K., Towers, K., & Ivers, R. (2017). Use of telehealth care of Indigenous peoples with chronic conditions: a systematic review. *Rural and Remote Health*, 17(3), 4205. doi:10.22605/RRH4205

Gehring, N. D., McGrath, P., Wozney, L., Soleimani, A., Bennett, K., Hartling, L., ... Newton, A. S. (2017). Pediatric eMental healthcare technologies: a systematic review of implementation foci in research studies, and government and organizational documents. *Implementation Science : IS*, 12, 76. <http://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0608-6>

Greenhalgh, T., A'Court, C., & Shaw, S. (2017a). Understanding heart failure; explaining telehealth - a hermeneutic systematic review. *BMC Cardiovascular Disorders*, 17(1), 156. DOI 10.1186/s12872-017-0594-2

Greenhalgh, T., Wherton, J., Papoutsi, C., Lynch, J., Hughes, G., A'Court, C., ... Shaw, S. (2017b). Beyond Adoption: A New Framework for Theorizing and Evaluating Nonadoption, Abandonment, and Challenges to the Scale-Up, Spread, and Sustainability of Health and Care Technologies. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 19(11), e367. <http://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8775>

Gur M, Nir V, Teleshov A, Bar-Yoseph R, Manor E, Diab G, et al. (2016) 229 The use of telehealth (WhatsApp and Skype based communication) in patients with cystic fibrosis. *Journal of Cystic Fibrosis* 15: S109.

Hendy J, Chrysanthaki T, Barlow J, Knapp M, Rogers A, Sanders C, et al. (2012) An organisational analysis of the implementation of telecare and telehealth: the whole systems demonstrator. *BMC Health Services Research* 12(1): 403.

Hepburn SL, Blakeley-Smith A, Wolff B and Reaven JA (2016) Telehealth delivery of cognitive-behavioral intervention to youth with autism spectrum disorder and anxiety: A pilot study. *Autism* 20(2): 207-218.

Honeyman M, Dunn P and McKenna H (2016) *Honeyman, M., Dunn, P., McKenna, H. (2016) A Digital NHS? an Introduction to the Digital Agenda and Plans for Implementation. the King's Fund. [Http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/](http://www.kingsfund.org.uk/). : The Kings Fund.*

Jennett, P, Jackson, A., Healy, T., Ho, K., Kazankian, A., Woolard, R., . . . Bates, J. (2003). A study of a rural community's readiness for telehealth. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare*, 9(5), 259-263. doi:10.1258/135763303769211265

Jury SC and Kornberg AJ (2016) Integrating telehealth in to 'business as usual': Is it really possible? *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 22(8): 499-503.

Kaye IY, Payan M and Vemulakonda VM (2016) Association between clean intermittent catheterization and urinary tract infection in infants and toddlers with spina bifida. *Journal of Pediatric Urology* 12(5): 284.e6.

Kruse CS, Krowski N, Rodriguez B, *et al.* (2017) Telehealth and patient satisfaction: a systematic review and narrative analysis. *BMJ Open* 2017;7:e016242. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-016242

Lemelle JL, Guillemin F, Aubert D, Guys JM, Lottmann H, Lortat-Jacob S, et al. (2006) Quality of Life and Continence in Patients with Spina Bifida. *Quality of Life Research* 15(9): 1481-1492.

Little L, Dunn W, Pope E and Wallisch A (2016) Feasibility of a Telehealth Coaching Intervention for Families of Children With Autism. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy* 70(4_Supplement_1): 7011515244.

MacNeill V, Sanders C, Fitzpatrick R, Hendy J, Barlow J, Knapp M, et al. (2014) Experiences of front-line health professionals in the delivery of telehealth: a qualitative study. *British Journal of General Practice* 64(624): E407.

Mair FS, May C, O'Donnell C, Finch T, Sullivan F and Murray E (2012) Factors that promote or inhibit the implementation of e-health systems: an explanatory systematic review. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 90(5): 357-364.

Mattingly C (1991) The narrative nature of clinical reasoning. *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 45(11): 998-1005.

Mistry H (2012) Systematic review of studies of the cost-effectiveness of telemedicine and telecare. Changes in the economic evidence over twenty years. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 18(1): 1-6.

- Munro J, Angus N and Leslie S (2013) Patient focused Internet-based approaches to cardiovascular rehabilitation – a systematic review. *Journal of Telemedicine and Telecare* 19(6): 347-353.
- Muttitt S, Vigneault R and Loewen L (2004) Integrating telehealth into Aboriginal healthcare: the Canadian experience. *International Journal of Circumpolar Health* 63(4): 401.
- National Clinical Guidance Centre (2012) *Urinary Incontinence in Neurological Disease: Assessment and Management.* Clinical Guideline [CG148]. London: NCGC.
- NHS England (2016) *Healthy Children: Transforming Child Health Information*. NHS England Publications Gateway 05454. Available at: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/digitaltechnology/child-health/> (Accessed 9 February 2018)
- Odeh B, Kayyali R, Nabhani-Gebara S and Philip N (2014) Implementing a telehealth service: nurses' perceptions and experiences. *British Journal of Nursing* 23(21): 1133-1137.
- Ouyang LJ, Grosse SD, Armour BS and Waitzman NJ (2007) Health care expenditures of children and adults with spina bifida in a privately insured US population. *Birth Defects Research Part a-Clinical and Molecular Teratology* 79(7): 552-558.
- Padua L, Rendeli C, Rabini A, Girardi E, Tonali P and Salvaggio E (2002) Health-related quality of life and disability in young patients with spina bifida. *Archives of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation* 83(10): 1384-1388.
- Radhakrishnan K, Xie B, Berkley A and Kim M (2016) Barriers and Facilitators for Sustainability of Tele-Homecare Programs: A Systematic Review. *Health Services Research* 51(1): 48-75.
- Ray KN, Ashcraft LE, Mehrotra A, Miller E, and Kahn JM (2017) Family Perspectives on Telemedicine for Pediatric Subspecialty Care. *Telemedicine and e-Health*. 23(10): 852-862
- Sanders, C., Rogers, A., Bowen, R., Bower, P., Hirani, S., Cartwright, M., ... & Chrysanthaki, T. (2012). Exploring barriers to participation and adoption of telehealth and telecare within the Whole System Demonstrator trial: a qualitative study. *BMC Health Services Research*, 12(1), 220.
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.
- Smith, A. C., Brown, C., Bradford, N., Caffery, L. J., Perry, C., & Armfield, N. R. (2015) Monitoring ear health through a telemedicine-supported health screening service in Queensland. *J Telemed Telecare*, 21(8): 427-430.

Smith K, Neville-Jan A, Freeman KA, Adams E, Mizokawa S, Dudgeon BJ, et al. (2016) The effectiveness of bowel and bladder interventions in children with spina bifida. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology* 58(9): 979-988.

Standing, C., Standing, S., McDermott, M., Gururajan, R. & Kiani Mavi, R. (2018) The Paradoxes of Telehealth: a Review of the Literature 2000–2015, *Systems Research and Behavioral Science*, 35(1): 90-101.

Taylor J, Coates E, Wessels B, Mountain G and Hawley MS (2015a) Implementing solutions to improve and expand telehealth adoption: participatory action research in four community healthcare settings. *BMC Health Services Research* 15(1): 529.

Taylor J, Coates E, Brewster L, Mountain G, Wessels B and Hawley MS (2015b) Examining the use of telehealth in community nursing: identifying the factors affecting frontline staff acceptance and telehealth adoption. *Journal of Advanced Nursing* 71(2): 326-337.

Vassilev I, Rowsell A, Pope C, Kennedy A, O'Cathain A, Salisbury C, et al. (2015) Assessing the implementability of telehealth interventions for self-management support: a realist review. *Implementation Science* 10(1): 59.

Vigil J, Litman R, Calouro C, Kattlove J, Marcin J and Kwong MW (2015) *Realizing the Promise of Telehealth for Children with Special Health Care Needs*. : Lucile Packard Foundation for Children's Health.

Watcher RM (2016) *Making IT Work: Harnessing the Power of Health Information Technology to Improve Care in England Report of the National Advisory Group on Health Information Technology in England*. Department of Health. Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/using-information-technology-to-improve-the-nhs> (Accessed 9 February 2018)

World Health Organization (2009) *Telemedicine: Opportunities and Developments in Member States. Report on the Second Global Survey on eHealth, Global Observatory for eHealth Series, Vol. 2*. . Geneva: WHO. Available at: http://www.who.int/goe/publications/ehealth_series_vol2/en/ (Accessed 9 February 2018)

Table 1: Summary of device type and action

Technology	URISYS 1100 (ROCHE) portable urinalysis device Safety tested by provider and hospital engineering department Weekly monitoring and as necessary
Bluetooth Devices	Weight scales Thermometer* Weight bi-weekly, temperature bi-weekly and as indicated
Electronic device	Device to record weekly voiding diary data / bladder & bowel management. This was on a mobile system that had no telephone connection but was a mid-range specification device. The voiding diary was informed from the NICE CG54 (2017) UTI diagnosis and management guideline. Parents and staff viewed and tested the data entry before use. Minor amendments were made to the diary in line with parental recommendations
Mobile Receivers (MR), devices receive alerts	(Daily monitoring between hours 8-6pm; Monday to Friday). Low specification mobile device to receive text messages and alerts from call centre and families

Table 2. Table of front line training delivered and data collection requirements

	Clinical staff	Parent	Commercial partner
Technology (urinalysis)	Face to face training how to use to support parents in home context / problem solving if failure.	Face to face training further supported by video tutorial (developed by nursing team) to augment learning in use, cleaning, safe use and storage. Collection, ordering and return of (all) equipment, reporting damage and failure.	Role in data reporting, alerts, transfer issues. Shipment of disposable supplies to families.
Bluetooth (scales, thermometer)	Hands on education around connectivity and how to re-boot systems.	Real time demonstration, training and troubleshooting. Safe use and storage. Home connectivity and wireless management.	Duty to report to nursing team data omission, equipment failure or connectivity challenges
Electronic device (ED) for data entry	Training / problem solving skills / remote access / data input / contact history and alert training and management	Face to face training supported further by summative sheet of instructions on use	Duty to report to nursing team data omissions and failures False alerts and scheduling
Mobile Receivers	Device training	Not applicable	Not applicable

Table 3: Overview of CATWOE findings

Root Definition – Telehealth intervention	CATWOE and TP1	CATWOE and TP3
<p>The pilot project represents a joint venture between the private and public sector that offers opportunities to benefit child health and the service ability to comply with national (NICE) data monitoring standards.</p> <p>It centres on a digital product owned by the private company, operated by parents and clinical staff. Provision of the equipment (by the private partner) and training in equipment use (provided by the private and public partners) will allow parents to regularly assess and parents and clinical team to take early action to limit the development of urinary tract infection (UTI) and associated complications for children with neuropathic bladder.</p>	Customer – child	Customer - child
	Actors – parents, clinical team, private company	Actors –parents, clinical team, private company, health gatekeepers, GPs
	Transformation – the installation of health connecting technology in the home; parents and clinicians trained in using technology; parents have a system to follow; print out to learn from and share	Transformation – Parent involved in regular urinalysis assessment; timely and easier action, use new language/communication, sense of confidence, belief in ability to act, gates opened; alerts sent to clinical team
	World view - Technology is an 'ordinary' feature of life, technology can release time, make regular assessment and monitoring easier.	World view - Technology (machine) generates authoritative information (print-out) for legitimate action (access to medical treatment); some monitoring too demanding, e.g. diary
	Ownership – the commercial partner and the clinical team shared the project	Ownership –Product owned by the commercial partner; action owned by parent; support system owned by clinical team
	Environment – National policy supports digital solutions. National (NICE) guidance on monitoring and assessment	Environment – Local work pressure from alerts; frustration from false positive alerts; disposable equipment availability; challenge of paediatric situation and monitoring plan fit with family practices

Figure 1: Positive changes noted by clinicians for families participating in the intervention




Figure 2: Less positive changes noted by clinicians for families participating in the intervention




Figure 3: Benefits for families resulting from participating in the intervention




Figure 4: Benefits experienced by CT and TT from participating in the intervention